DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 320 95 SP 012 281

AUTHOR Lewis, Carol; And Others
TITLE State Departments of Education and the New Teacher Centers Program.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Educational Systems Development.; National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Annotated Bibliographies; *Board of Education Role; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Information Dissemination; Resource Centers; *State Boards of Education; *Teacher Centers; Technical Assistance

ABSTRACT

This publication is a compendium of resources gathered to aid state education agency (SEA) staff members as they set about implementing the federal Teacher Centers Program established by Public Law 94-482. The document details (1) the role of SEAs as mandated in that legislation, (2) the responsibility of SEAs in the initial review and screening of Teacher Centers Program applications, (3) the legislative provisions concerning technical assistance by SEAs to funded teacher centers and the compensation available to them for such aid, and (4) SEA information dissemination activities concerning funded centers and available compensation for that effort. Checklists for activities in each of these areas are provided. Appendices include: (1) an overview of the Teacher Centers Program, taken from the U.S. Commissioner of Education's "Report on Teacher Centers"; (2) frequently asked policy questions on the federal mandate, the SEA's role, and local situations; (3) an annotated bibliography, citing books, pamphlets, speeches, and journal issues/articles considered as "must" reading, as well as a bibliography of periodicals consistently devoted to teacher centers; (4) National Teacher Centers Program state coordinators; and (5) other major resource centers. (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151320

Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

State Departments of Education and the New Teacher Centers Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Published in cooperation with the Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND THE NEW TEACHER CENTERS PROGRAM

Writing Committee

CAROL LEWIS, Chairperson
Michigan Department of Education

JOHN ADAMS
Council of Chief State School Officers

FRED ANDELMAN
Massachusetts Teachers Association

JAMES COLLINS
National Council of States on Inservice Education

KATHERINE FARQUHAR
Central Massachusetts Regional Education Center

WILLIAM HERING
Teachers' Center Exchange

ELEANORE McMAHON
Rhode Island College

ARNETTE RAUSCHEL
Illinois Office of Education

EMMITT SMITH
Private Consultant

JACK STEINBERG
Philadelpha Federation of Teachers

SAM YARGER
Syracuse University

Published by

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

USOE, Division of Educational Systems Development
Washington, D.C. 20202

SP 012 281
March 1978

ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a nationwide information system of the National Institute of Education whose basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents in education, and to publicize the availability of such documents. Through a network of specialized clearinghouses, ERIC gathers, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes these materials, and processes them into a central computerized data system.

The scope of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is the preparation and continuing development of education personnel, as well as selected aspects of health education, physical education, and recreation education. The Clearinghouse is funded by the National Institute of Education, in cooperation with the following associations:

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Association of Teacher Educators
National Education Association

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in cooperation with the Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Clearinghouse, USOE, AACTE, or the National Institute of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

FOREWORD
Karl Massanari iv

INTRODUCTION
Allen Schmieder 1

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND THE
NEW TEACHER CENTERS PROGRAM 3

Role of the State Education Agency 3

Review of Applications 4
A Checklist of Some Key Points Regarding the
SEA's Review of Applications 6

Technical Assistance 6
A Checklist for Developing the SEA Technical
Assistance Capacity 8

Dissemination 9

Procedures for Compensating the SEA 10

Continuation of Projects--The State Role 10

A FINAL WORD 11

APPENDIX A: THE NEW TEACHER CENTER PROGRAM 12
Charles Lovett and Allen Schmieder

APPENDIX B: THE MOST COMMONLY ASKED POLICY QUESTIONS 19

APPENDIX C: MUST READING--AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY
OF KEY PUBLICATIONS 27

APPENDIX D: NATIONAL TEACHER CENTERS PROGRAM:
STATE COORDINATORS 31

APPENDIX E: OTHER MAJOR RESOURCE CENTERS 35

FOREWORD

The rapid spread of the teacher center movement in this country has taken place at the grass roots--wherever teachers have felt impelled to come together to share experiences and knowledge with their peers and to obtain, in a supportive atmosphere, practical training targeted at their current, self-perceived needs. And as the movement caught fire and teacher centers multiplied, so also grew an urgency to enlist federal involvement in their funding.

The passage of Public Law 94-482 ensured federal support for the establishment and expansion of teacher centers nationwide. The national Teacher Centers Program encourages a strong role for state education agencies in (a) review and screening of applications for federal grants, (b) technical assistance to funded programs, and (c) dissemination of program outcomes.

This publication, produced cooperatively by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education, is intended to offer resources to aid SEAs in fulfilling these responsibilities. As the USOE agency housing the national office of the Teacher Centers Program, the Division coordinated the compilation of suggestions and materials included herein. The Clearinghouse, as a part of its commitment to solidifying the foundations of knowledge about the preparation of education professionals, lent assistance in the technical production of the document.

The Clearinghouse has long recognized the potential impact of teacher centers, particularly for inservice education. Four earlier Clearinghouse publications--a state-of-the-scene monograph, reports of conferences sponsored by two of the federally funded pilot teacher centers, and an extensive indexed bibliography--are listed as "must reading" in Appendix C of the present booklet. Without doubt, federal funding will prompt increased interest in and availability of information about teacher centers, and the Clearinghouse will endeavor to make such information widely available to the education community.

In addition, readers are invited to submit documents about teacher centers to the Clearinghouse for possible inclusion in the ERIC system. We also encourage comments about the publication itself.

KARL MASSANARI
Director, ERIC Clearinghouse
on Teacher Education

INTRODUCTION

This is not a set of guidelines for establishing or managing teacher centers--it is a compendium of resources for strengthening them. The U.S. Office of Education Teacher Centers Program invited a committee of leaders in the teacher center movement to compile a booklet of suggestions for state education agency (SEA) staff members as they set about implementing the new federal Teacher Centers Program. The first draft of the document was submitted for reaction to a National Teacher Center Workshop, held in Washington, D.C., February 9-10, 1978, to which SEA representatives from all states and territories were invited. Input from the workshop was then incorporated into the resource booklet. The booklet is in no sense a substitute for the official regulation of the Teacher Centers Program. That regulation, published January 11, 1978, in the Federal Register, together with its preamble and appendix, is the only source of USOE policy on the Teacher Centers Program. This booklet is meant only as an added resource for state education agency personnel.

By design, the Office of Education encourages the state education agency to exercise complete freedom within the law in the implementation of the Teacher Centers Program. It was clearly the intent of Congress that teacher centers serve to bring the development of inservice education programs closer to the teacher and the classroom through higher levels of input and control by teachers than has traditionally been the case. It was also envisioned by Congress that the states would play a strong role in implementing this idea and would have the flexibility to approach the implementation in ways best suited to each state.

The federal law for the new national Teacher Centers Program gives to the SEA responsibility for (a) review and screening of applications, (b) technical assistance to funded programs, and (c) dissemination of results derived from those funded programs. The manner in which these responsibilities are met is left entirely to the state. The SEA may choose simply to pass proposals along to the U.S. Office of Education and become minimally involved with centers in that state, or it may choose to provide strong leadership in statewide center and inservice development. It is our impression that SEAs are generally dedicated to developing the best possible educational programs for their teachers, and the USOE teacher center staff is committed to building the strongest possible partnership with the states in that effort.

We deeply appreciate the work of the writing committee in putting together this monograph and especially commend chairperson Carol Lewis for her strong, task-oriented leadership. We would also like to thank the staff of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education for their work in producing the final document. Their support of this effort, the fifth in a growing ERIC series on teacher centers, accentuates their continuing concern for promoting the development of teacher centers.

For further information on or clarification of the state role in the Teacher Centers Program, contact the appropriate state teacher center coordinator listed in Appendix D of this document, or the national Teacher Centers Program Office, Room 5652, Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C., 20202; telephone (202) 245-2235.

ALLEN SCHMIEDER, Chief
Teacher Centers Program

March 1978

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND
THE NEW TEACHER CENTERS PROGRAM

ROLE OF THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

Statutory and regulatory provisions of the Teacher Centers Program call for state education agencies to play a key role in the development of the program.

- States have three required functions: (a) review, screening, and recommendation of applications and their transmittal to the U.S. Commissioner of Education; (b) provision of technical assistance to teacher centers, and (c) dissemination, within their separate jurisdictions, of information about the experience and "lessons learned" of funded teacher centers.

- Federal law and regulation make it possible for the SEA to take a leadership role in linking the Teacher Centers Program with other state and federal programs underway in the state. Since inservice education is a concern in most states, the Teacher Centers Program can be utilized by the state as a means of reinforcing its own program of inservice education.

- The Teacher Centers Program endeavors to foster collaboration among SEAs, teachers' professional organizations, local education agencies (LEAs), and institutions of higher education. The SEA is uniquely situated to assume leadership in facilitating this collaboration.

- The role of each SEA in the development of the Teacher Centers Program is necessarily unique in accordance with the state's involvement in statewide programs of staff development, teacher centering, and related activities such as needs assessments and efforts to ensure accountability. Consequently, the role of the SEAs will vary widely: some will need to interrelate many ongoing state and federal programs with the provisions of the Teacher Centers Program; others will have little to relate to, and will find a need to pioneer the development of a strong SEA program for the support of professional development for teachers.

- In establishing its basic role in the Teacher Centers Program, the SEA staff will need to make decisions concerning the state's level of involvement. It may be that a general state plan should be developed, addressing such central issues as (a) the extent to which the SEA staff will become involved in providing technical assistance to groups preparing applications, (b) the proposal review process at the state level, (c) the nature of technical assistance which will be made available to teacher centers, and (d) the state's role in documenting projects. Again, states have wide latitude as to how they perform these functions.

- In states where teacher centers are funded, the leadership role will be supported by technical assistance funds as described in the federal regulation. In states where no teacher centers are funded during the first year of the program, the degree and nature of leadership will vary markedly according to availability of funds and staff time. The leadership role in

nonfunded states can be exercised in several ways: (a) designation of state teacher center liaison persons, (b) continuous contact with the USOE Teacher Centers Office, (c) participation to the extent possible in activities sponsored by that Office, (d) study of first year proposals, nonfunded as well as funded, to extract information relevant to statewide inservice needs and programming, and (e) continued high awareness of the Teacher Centers Program. States that do not receive funding are encouraged to develop ways to provide assistance to nonfunded teacher centers. In the next funding cycle of the Teacher Centers Program, the nonfunded states will be able to resume and expand upon their original roles in the program.

• The SEA has a role in decisions regarding the continuation of projects which are initially approved for grants extending beyond one year. Since federal regulations require a demonstration of satisfactory performance, and since all requests for continuation grants also must be submitted for approval to the SEA, the opportunity for state leadership is quite evident. The obligation to provide high level technical assistance and dissemination services to funded centers so that they may meet successfully both state and federal requirements becomes paramount.

REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS

The responsibility for initial review and screening of Teacher Centers Program applications is placed with the SEA. Section 197.10(a) of the Regulations states that each SEA is to review applications from that state, make comments, and forward recommended applications to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for further considerations.

• The SEA may develop and use its own criteria for the initial review of applications. The SEA-initiated criteria need not relate in any way to the criteria the U.S. Commissioner of Education will use for evaluating applications, but state criteria which negate or contravene the federal criteria will have the effect of weakening or eliminating the chances of final approval of that state's applications.

• SEA-initiated criteria have the purposes of (a) interrelating the new Teacher Centers Program with programs and activities already underway, (b) focusing Teacher Centers Program applications on state goals or priorities, (c) emphasizing specific curricular content areas, (d) providing for linkage between preservice and inservice education, and (e) integrating the organization of federal teacher centers with an existing or emerging network of state centers.

• The SEA must make comments on any application it chooses to recommend and transmit to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for further consideration; determination of the nature and extent of those comments is a prerogative of the SEA. Since USOE evaluation of applications, as required by law, will be based only on the federal review criteria (Section 197.11), those SEA comments bearing directly on federal criteria will be considered in the USOE review process. In states where SEA-initiated criteria are being used in addition to the federal review criteria, a clear distinction should be made between comments based on the federal criteria and

comments based on SEA-initiated criteria. It should be emphasized that comments from SEA officials about the proposal quality as judged against the federal criteria are also highly important.

• The SEA is responsible for reviewing and screening applications and may do this in any way it sees fit, using for this purpose individuals or panels chosen on any basis whatsoever. Given the importance of the policy boards in the program and the fact that USOE has indicated that its review panels will reflect the required composition of the policy boards, SEAs may find it advisable to do the same in their selection of readers. Federal administrative policy also requires at least one reading per proposal by a USOE official--SEAs may choose to follow suit. SEAs may also want to involve already formed SEA policy advisory groups to staff development programs. Whatever the process and the personnel, the SEA should document and maintain careful records of its review procedures in order to be prepared for later inquiries and scrutiny by its constituents under the Freedom of Information Act.

• The SEA plan to review applications and the criteria (if any) to be used should be completed as quickly as possible and disseminated to potential applicants.

• The SEA may offer technical assistance and advice to the applicant at any time before forwarding the proposal to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. This may apply even to the applicant whose proposal is received by the state and determined to be incomplete, technically inadequate, or illegal by virtue of not meeting a specific requirement of the law or regulation. SEAs should bear in mind, however, that advice or help given to applicants after the closing date (March 30), unless offered to all applicants, may appear to give the aided applicant an unfair advantage over those not contacted.

• Applications recommended by the SEA are due in the U.S. Office of Education on or before May 1, 1978. Those not received by that date will not be considered for support. So (barring an "Act of God") states that do not deliver recommended proposals on time will have to be accountable to their constituents for the "technical" rejection of late proposals.

• Any applicant whose proposal has not been recommended by the SEA may appeal to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for reconsideration. The appeal must be in writing and must reach the Commissioner by May 8, 1978. To expedite the appeal process, a copy of the appeal should be sent simultaneously to the Teacher Centers Program, Division of Educational Systems Development, in the U.S. Office of Education. Upon receipt of a letter of appeal, the U.S. Commissioner will request that the SEA reconsider the application. Any application reconsidered by the SEA as a result of the appeal process and found to be recommendable must be received by the U.S. Office of Education no later than May 15, 1978.

• Federal criteria to be used as a basis for evaluating applications for funding for teacher centers are set forth in Section 197.11 of the Teacher Centers Program Regulations. An application must receive a minimum of 50 points at the federal level to be considered for funding.

A Checklist of Some Key Points
Regarding the SEA's Review of Applications

1. The SEA may set any criteria it finds desirable for the review of applications.

   USOE urges, but cannot require, that the SEA's criteria be made known as soon as possible to all possible applicants in the state.

   The SEA may choose to use the criteria of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

   The SEA may choose to set no criteria at all, but in practical terms this would mean that the SEA intends to transmit all applications received and without substantive comment. If it withholds even one application, there must logically be a basis (criterion) for making that decision.

2. It would seem that the SEA may use its review criteria to favor any course of action not prohibited by the regulation. If the criteria are used to produce an action or decision that nullifies or contravenes a requirement of the regulation, USOE would have no authority to make the SEA cease and desist, but an aggrieved applicant would have recourse to the appeal process.

   As a practical matter, such applications might be found ineligible on technical grounds, or at a disadvantage in the USOE review process.

3. The SEA must make comments on any application it chooses to recommend and transmit to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for further consideration.

   Determination of the nature and extent of the comments is a prerogative of the SEA.

4. USOE will take into account in its review of applications only those comments by the SEA which bear directly upon the Commissioner's review criteria.

   This means, in effect, that the USOE reviewers will be allowed to see the SEA's comments.

   USOE and its reviewers will not take into account (a) a rank order established by the SEA, or (b) a numerical or other "value" rating for the applications it transmits.

5. The SEA reviews both new applications and applications requesting assistance to continue a center for a second or third year.

6. The SEA has the prerogative to determine how it will review applications and whom it will use to perform this function.

7. An SEA may, if it so chooses, work with its potential applicants in the preparation of their applications, but can be compensated only for technical assistance given to funded projects.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

State education agencies may be compensated under the new federal Teacher Centers Program for providing technical assistance to funded

teacher centers. A wide range of activities may be classified under technical assistance.

- The SEA may provide needed consultative service at the teacher center site or through workshops and conferences at the local, regional, or state level.

- The SEA may devise a way to utilize the resources of consultant personnel on the SEA staff--for example, in reading, social studies, special education, vocational education--to help the teacher center as it develops and operates the Teacher Centers Program. The SEA may also wish to use leaders from related staff development programs--Teacher Corps, Special Education, and the like.

- The SEA may facilitate linkages among federally supported centers and between federal centers and those supported from other sources. This network could facilitate the exchange of information between teacher centers. In a spirit of cooperation and learning, centers may become aware of possibilities they may not discover individually, eliminate possible duplication of services, compare notes on best sources of materials, and profit by each other's mistakes.

- Travel support for center-to-center visitation may be supported by SEA technical assistance funds.

- Institutions of higher education (IHEs) are important resources for teacher centers. The SEA may want to provide technical assistance by identifying the extent and nature of these resources and making centers aware of them. As teacher centers use the services provided by IHEs and other consultants and evaluate their usefulness, the SEA can initiate and maintain a resource bank of consultative services and make it available to all teacher centers.

- The SEA could provide technical assistance in the development of a more effective product "delivery system" by linking the center with local, regional, state, and national dissemination systems that are concerned with the implementation of validated products and with the use of improved educational approaches and materials reflecting current results of educational research.

- Professional teachers organizations could be extremely important in helping the SEA to locate sources of assistance for teacher centers. A list of some of these organizations that have interest in teacher centers is presented in Appendix E. State affiliates of these organizations can also be very helpful and the addresses of the appropriate groups and persons in each state can be obtained from the national offices of the parent organizations.

- SEAs in other states should be contacted about assistance processes, places, and persons that have worked well in their states. Appendix D lists Teacher Centers Program contact persons in each state and territory.

- The Teacher Corps has developed an outstanding series of technical assistance networks. Not only do these networks contain important

resources for meeting some of the needs that will be identified in the federally funded teacher centers, but specific language in the Teacher Corps legislation encourages such cooperation.

• A number of organizations, both in the federal government and outside it, have good resources for states and localities. Contact persons at a number of such places are listed in Appendix E.

• It should be kept in mind when developing the SEA plan for technical assistance and dissemination that there are other overlaps between the two, and many projected SEA activities could be categorized under both. A "dissemination" workshop, for example, based on experience from existing centers would also represent a form of technical assistance for participants who are interested in starting a center.

A Checklist for Developing the SEA Technical Assistance Capacity

The following are areas of technical assistance in which SEAs should generally be most qualified among the major education agencies and constituencies and which could serve as a framework for developing the SEA technical assistance plan.

1. Assistance based on information and policy developments at the national level; for example, in relation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Major Initiatives Tracking System (MITS) plan, or program policy and materials issued by the Teacher Centers Program Office

2. Assistance based on teacher center experience in other states

3. Assistance based on relationships between teacher centers and other staff development programs administered by the SEA, such as Teacher Corps, PL 94-142, Vocational Education

4. Assistance based on teacher center experience or related staff development programs in other parts of the state for which the SEA has responsibility, such as linking centers with other centers or centers with other specific resources within the state

5. Assistance derived from specific specialists within the SEA; for example, social studies, language, or educational alternatives specialists

6. Facilitation of linkages between center-determined needs and technical assistance resources within the state--in higher education, other local education agencies, the organized profession

7. Assistance in the form of leadership development; for example, training for center staff in areas of concern developed mutually by the SEA and center(s)

8. Leadership in understanding the teacher center concept--such as promoting statewide dialog on key centering issues, sponsoring awareness conferences about the teacher center concept.

DISSEMINATION

The dissemination of information about the activities of funded teacher centers is required in the Teacher Centers Program, and compensation is provided to support it. A plan for dissemination must be submitted by the SEA to the U.S. Office of Education at the time its applications are forwarded for consideration by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. SEAs have considerable flexibility in the development of their dissemination plans, much more so than for the other two areas of SEA responsibilities. The major intent is to reach the widest relevant audience with lessons learned form operating centers.

• In developing the plan for dissemination, the SEA staff may want to consider the purpose of dissemination activities, the nature of information to be conveyed, the intended outcomes of such dissemination, and the identification of appropriate audiences.

• The development and gathering of information for dissemination are closely related to the federal funding criteria requiring the grantee to report project effectiveness and to disseminate its results. Basically, this is a documentation activity. The SEA needs to fulfill its part of the documentation requirement in a developmental mode. Skills in what might be called "developmental documentation" are needed to establish a nonthreatening relationship with the grantee as documentation is generated, translated into usable form, synthesized with information from other sources, put into an effective format for dissemination, and publicized. Developmental documentation and analysis may be particularly difficult for the SEA since it must also review requests for second and third year continuation of funded teacher centers. Consequently, the SEA may want to consider assigning the dissemination role to different personnel from those responsible for the review of applications.

• The SEA may want to utilize existing structures and processes for dissemination as it develops its dissemination system for the Teacher Centers Program. Existing newsletters and reports, regularly scheduled conferences, and meetings of professional and other education organizations are several outlets for spotlighting teacher center activities.

• Decisions on what types of information to share will be made by the SEA both at the time the dissemination plan is forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education and throughout the funding cycle. The SEA staff may wish to consider disseminating information on such topics as governance, needs assessment, staffing, curriculum development, resource identification, teacher-developed materials, program elements related to state priorities, evaluation, types of participants, incentives, scope of program, and impact of program.

• SEAs may want to give high priority to facilitating the sharing of those teacher-developed products and processes that the SEA and center staffs mutually agree have potential for other teachers. One of the primary purposes of teacher centers is to facilitate sharing from teacher to teacher. Although most of the wisdom about teaching resides with the practitioner, most of the products and processes currently being disseminated in the nation's schools have not been developed by teachers.

• Lessons-learned workshops, based on existing center experience, and involving all those from the state who are interested in teacher centers, have proven to be highly successful in the few states that have sponsored such programs.

PROCEDURES FOR COMPENSATING THE SEA

The following procedures will be followed in compensating state education agencies for application review, and for technical and dissemination services:

1. All states receiving proposals for review will be paid $50 for each proposal reviewed.

2. Each state having funded projects will receive the same percentage of the available technical assistance and dissemination money (in fiscal year 1978, $825,000 less cost of the SEA proposal review) as is received in that state for support of teacher center projects. Example: If $750,000 remains after proposal review costs ($50 times the total number of proposals received in the nation) are met, and the funded projects in a particular state total five percent of the dollars available for projects, that state will receive five percent of the $750,000--or $37,500--for technical assistance and dissemination services.

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS--THE STATE ROLE

For grants extending beyond one year, the federal regulation requires that satisfactory performance be demonstrated. Requests for continuation of a grant for the second and third years must be submitted for approval to the state education agency. The SEA's right to review, and its obligation to provide technical assistance and dissemination services, strongly imply a responsibility to aid funded projects in their development so that they may successfully meet both state and federal continuation requirements. State education agency staffs should keep abreast of likely deadline dates so that they may plan activities related to continuation requests well in advance.

A FINAL WORD

With freedom comes responsibility. Will the states merely meet the minimum requirements of the law? Or will they accept the challenge that is implied in the Teacher Centers Program to come up with truly creative approaches to a long-acknowledged educational need--the development of inservice education programs that are more directly related to teachers and their classroom needs?

The federal law and regulation give considerable discretion to the SEA as to how the SEA dollars are to be spent. This discretion and the three mandated SEA functions provide a strong foundation for state leadership in the Teacher Centers Program. SEAs have a great opportunity to show the way in promoting the program; fostering collaboration in its development; facilitating interaction and sharing among teacher centers and between teacher centerers and other educators; and sponsoring top-level dialog, study, and publications on important centering issues.

When giving testimony at the public hearings on the program, SEA critics called for limiting the state role on the grounds that SEAs generally do not have a leadership capacity in inservice education and would use the funds to add staff and build bureaucracies. Because of the increasing importance of SEAs in insevice education and the high enthusiasm of so many educators for the potential of the teacher center concept, it is imperative that SEAs demonstrate strong leadership in this program. It should be a delight proving such critics to be in considerable error.

Appendix A

THE NEW TEACHER CENTER PROGRAM*

Charles Lovett
Allen Schmieder

U.S. Office of Education

On October 12, 1976, the new national Teacher Centers Program was signed into law by the President. The past decade, which had seen an exponential expansion in the roles and responsibilities of "regular" classroom teachers, had shown an almost equally impressive increase in the number of new federal and state programs directed at improving and reforming what happens in the nation's classrooms. But the two were almost never linked. Most programs authorized by these laws and intended to raise the quality of schooling had to be implemented without the necessary staff development; most were "outside-in" programs--solutions developed somewhere outside the classroom and then expected to match the most urgent problems within the classroom.

The new teacher center law turned things "inside out." Teachers finally will be given the major responsibility for determining the kinds of changes and improvements that are needed in their classrooms and will also have the lead in putting together the kinds of training and curriculum development programs that will best meet those needs. And center programs will draw heavily on the experience and expertise of the teachers themselves. In all of the passion during recent years to improve the knowledge base of education, most experts and policy makers have usually overlooked what is by far the most important part of that base--the classroom tested knowledge of teachers.

At a recent meeting, the director of a major educational development enterprise understandably boasted that his high-powered staff included over 100 person-years of experience in educational reform. One could argue that the nation's teachers constitute 20 million person-years of experience in educational reform. The teacher center provides one mechanism for further releasing the potential of this vast storehouse of educational successes. It is possible that the greatest advances in education in the near future will be gained through developing more effective ways to link the creativity and experience of every classroom to every other classroom.

As this is written, the new program is still being shaped by the sound democratic process that has become part of the regulations development system. Congress' thoughtful and well-conceived statute . . . and the U.S. Office of Education's proposed rules for administering the Act inspired more than 2,000 separate recommendations from the field. The importance of the teacher center concept was evident in this vigorous and constructively critical response that had substantial contributions from all major constituencies in the education spectrum. Following is a brief description of how the new program will work.

* This chapter is taken, with only minor revisions, from the recently published U.S. Commissioner's Report on Teacher Centers. It is included because it is probably the best brief overview of the program and the Commissioner's Report had a very limited printing.

The basic purpose of the Teacher Centers Program is to enable teachers to have a greater voice in determining and meeting their own needs for inservice training and curriculum development in relation to the needs of the students whom they serve. Teacher centers may serve a single school district, a larger region, or an entire state. The chief feature of the centers is that each is supervised by a "teacher center policy board," of which the majority of members are elementary or secondary school classroom teachers. The program gives to state departments of education an important three-part role: screening applications, providing technical assistance, and assuring proper dissemination of the program's findings and products. Ten percent of the funds may be granted to institutions of higher education to operate centers; the balance goes to local education agencies.

Recognizing that the completion of the regulation process may yet change the nature of the program in some important ways, the following briefly outlines the major characteristics of the Teacher Center Program.

1. It is the first major federal program that requires that the teachers being served be centrally involved in planning, developing, and implementing projects.

2. It will increase the professional resource base by increasing the role of the classroom teacher as innovator, researcher, developer, and trainer.

3. It is directed primarily at helping teachers with current classroom instructional problems.

4. It is directed mainly at the inservice education of all teachers--regardless of level or subject.

5. It is directed at all teachers in the project service area.

6. It is a relatively flexible and open program approach capable of responding quickly to immediate needs.

7. Teacher center projects can serve both individual needs and system needs.

8. The projects will be as site-specific as possible--located as close to the classroom of participants as possible.

9. Because of released time allowances, part of the programming can occur during the "regular day."

10. A high percentage of participation will be voluntary.

11. It can facilitate instructional improvement, necessitating the kind of attitudinal/behavior changes which require long-range training programs.

12. It is primarily an inservice education program, but can have significant links to preservice programs.

13. It marshals the best possible resources--from a great variety of sources--to help teachers with immediate instructional problems.

14. It promotes an idea that could eventually serve all of the nation's teachers.

15. It can accommodate considerable variety in grant size and program models.

16. It provides a potential delivery system for major staff development needs supported by other national and state authorizations--education for all handicapped children, consumer education, career education, metric education.

17. It supports a generic model of inservice education, not just courses or workshops.

18. It requires collaboration among teachers, teachers organizations, higher education, special education, vocational education, the school board, and the state education agency.

19. It provides substantial support for state involvement, especially in areas of technical assistance and dissemination.

Although the first chapter [of the Commissioner's Report] outlines some of the antecedents of this program, it does not specify the problems which helped to stimulate its development. Congress and other national leaders are increasingly concerned about this issue. Joseph Young, who served as Executive Director of the President's Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, suggested that one of the major weaknesses of most new federal programs was that they rarely articulated the problems they were being launched to overcome. Many program developers, he added, did not even consider whether they were dealing with any specific problems. He went on to recommend that at the beginning of any new legislative thrust, a succinct statement of the problems to be confronted should be developed and used as one of the major bases for later estimations of program successes. As a context, we present a beginning list of some of the needs that gave rise to the new Teacher Centers Program and to which it may be expected to relate. The list is presented to give added focus to what follows and, it is hoped, to motivate readers sufficiently to help improve it.

1. Traditional inservice education programs are generally not directly related to teachers' most urgent needs, as teachers see them.

2. Inservice education, regardless of quality, is generally provided in places that are far removed from where teachers teach, making it inconvenient and relatively unrelated to what is happening in schools.

3. Inservice education has generally been provided for teachers by professionals other than teachers. Consequently, its purposes often have not facilitated interaction between teachers and encouraged sharing of successful classroom experiences.

4. Similarly, school curricula are sometimes designed and developed by professionals with little or no recent classroom experience, yet must be implemented by teachers. Some curriculum developers go so far as to attempt to design "teacher-proof" curricula.

5. The training priorities of federal programs are often unrelated to needs as teachers perceive them.

6. Traditional inservice systems are not designed to respond system-wide and quickly to urgent local needs.

7. With accelerating change and expansion of the knowledge base, there is an urgent need for all teachers to continually renew their knowledge and skills.

8. Unemployed teachers need to be retrained for new and needed roles in education.

9. There is a need to prepare thousands of education personnel in such areas as special education, counseling, and early childhood education.

No program, especially one supported with federal funds, operates in isolation from the rest of the education world. The trends and forces of the total national scene, and the way in which a particular program relates to them, often have more to do with its relative success and impact than whatever happens within specific projects. This larger context is especially important with teacher centers because of their considerable potential for reforming inservice education--and because of the high interest of all of the major education constituencies in its programmatic growth and direction. Following is a summary of some of the national conditions and events that may have great relevance for the future of centering--and vice versa.

1. The decline in school enrollment has resulted in widespread layoffs and reductions in force in a large number of school systems. Significant numbers of teachers have been forced to shift positions. In New York City, for example, nearly 40 percent of the teachers of English, mathematics, and science have had to assume new and different assignments during the past several years. Considerable training will be needed to help these displaced teachers adjust to their new responsibilities.

2. With declining student enrollments and provisions in most master contracts for layoffs to be made on a seniority basis, the professional work force will increasingly include more persons (a) with extended experience, (b) at the maximum salary, and (c) with higher levels of college or university preparation than before. Because formal academic preparation tends to be completed within the first six years of employment, this same trend will produce a work force whose most recent higher education experience will become more distant with each passing year. Further, the percentage of teachers needing more credits/courses for certification/promotion/

salary increases is sharply decreasing. In short, incentives for formal education are declining. In such cases, the only way that teachers can continue professional improvement will be through inservice education/teacher centers.

3. School needs and priorities are changing more and more rapidly each year. The classroom teacher of 1977, for example, is asked to be the major implementor of special education's mainstreaming, citizenship education, consumer education, community education, metric education, multicultural education, career education, energy education, etc., etc., etc. The 1960s provided considerable evidence that no new curriculum can be successfully introduced into the system without (a) acceptance by teachers and (b) considerable staff development, developed mainly by the teachers to be involved.

4. The rapidly rising unemployment of qualified/certified teachers, estimated to exceed 500,000 in 1977, has important implications for teacher centers--especially in light of President Carter's commitment to reduce unemployment. In New York City, for example, in 1975 only 3 percent of the eligible new teachers found jobs; 97 percent were added to the unemployment roles. There are, however, severe shortages of teachers in a number of specialty areas; for example, special education, counseling and guidance, early childhood education. The Teacher Centers Program could give priority to retraining unemployed teachers in these and other shortage areas. Such a plan would not only reduce unemployment, but take less time, cost less, and develop broader-based specialists than programs that started from scratch with undergraduate students.

5. With declining student achievement scores over much of the nation, there have been increasing public demands that the schools "return to the basics." School boards and other community leaders are reordering school priorities. The reversal of these declining scores may require the kind of large-scale inservice retraining program fostered by the NDEA and NSF institute programs developed in response to Sputnik. Teacher centers could provide such programs.

6. California, New York, and several other "leader" states are giving high emphasis to ensuring that all teachers are competent in the teaching of reading. Given the high importance of the subject, it is likely that many other states will follow. Such a trend will require training and retraining for all teachers at all levels. The Right To Read program has done a commendable job (and could be closely coordinated with teacher center efforts) but is not generally directed at supporting inservice education in reading for all of the teachers in a school system. The teacher center is ideally suited to carry out such a program.

7. There is increasing interest--in response to the rising cost of education and increased demands for educational accountability--in a more effective utilization of research findings regarding what

works in the classroom. Relatively sophisticated national, state, and local diffusion and dissemination networks are being developed. The Office of Education, the National Institute of Education, and other agencies have growing catalogs of "proven" products and approaches. As with general curriculum reform, the effective adoption and use of any validated educational product will require staff development. Good product delivery systems will fail without adequate training counterparts.

The Teacher Centers Program has captured the national interest. A great many educators are preparing to help develop and implement centers. Others are considering ways in which existing centers might be changed or productively linked with other teacher centers and resource bases. The high potential of the concept has been emphasized. But from the beginning, there will be a need to carefully think through what kinds of information will be needed by educational decision makers--in the field and in the government--in order to determine the program's relative success. Too often methods of "keeping track" of what goes on are introduced well after a program is underway--when it is too late, or at least at a time when it is difficult to build in the kind of data collection and assessment systems that will not only help policy makers but prove indispensable to program managers.

In his landmark study of American education, Crisis in the Classroom, Silberman pointed up the fact that even where new educational approaches seemed to be succeeding, it was difficult to pin down why they were successful, because Ameican educators did not usually have enough management information to be articulate about what was going on in their programs. The Office of Education does not want to place too much emphasis on evaluation of the Teacher Centers Program outcomes during the early going--the concept is new and it will take considerable time to work out many of the new processes that will be required in making programs fully operational. However, there is a need to begin to develop reasonable program expectations and then to begin the kind of data collection that will eventually help determine the extent to which those goals are being achieved.

The following list is offered to give center developers and operators some guidance, whether or not supported by federal funds, regarding the kinds of outcomes they might want to measure, and to stimulate as much thoughtful dialog as possible about this most important subject.

1. Effectiveness as perceived by teachers

2. Effectiveness as perceived by administrators

3. Degree to which teachers' individual needs are met

4. Degree to which the high priority training needs of school systems are met

5. Relationship of training programs to substance of curriculum in classroom of participants

6. Impact on student achievement

7. Impact on teaching skills

8. Proximity to schools and communities of participants

9. Proportion of training during "regular" school hours

10. Degree of teacher input into program development and implementation

11. Extent of teacher-developed curricula used in training programs

12. Extent to which programs are more comprehensive and systematic than traditional inservice programs

13. Amount of teacher interaction and sharing of classroom successes

14. Increase in utilization of new learning concepts, approaches, and research findings

15. Degree to which teachers are better prepared in high priority staff development needs areas, such as mainstreaming, basic skills, reading, energy education

16. Impact in terms of the above on other forms of inservice education.

This chapter has roughly outlined the nature of the new Teacher Centers Program from the viewpoint of the program managers in the Office of Education. It must be emphasized that this analysis and characterization is a tentative one which is sure to change, in some cases substantially. As the program evolves, important lessons will be learned, and necessary adjustments will be made. . . .

Appendix B

THE MOST COMMONLY ASKED POLICY QUESTIONS

The questions which follow are those most commonly asked. Some relate to the federal mandate, some to the SEA's role, some to unique local situations. The answers in almost all cases come either from the law itself or from the official responses to comments which were published as an appendix to the Teacher Centers Program regulation.

General

Q. What is a teacher center?

A. It is a program designed to improve elementary and secondary school instruction by enabling teachers to share experiences and successes and to marshal learning resources to meet the needs of their students. It is designed to increase the involvement of teachers in their own professional development. It is a program of inservice teacher training and curriculum development supervised and managed principally by the teachers themselves, and designed to improve the schooling received by their students.

Q. Who can participate in teacher center activities?

A. In addition to regular, full-time classroom teachers, the persons to be served by the teacher center may be determined by the teacher center policy board to include paraprofessionals, teacher aides, preschool teachers, teachers of adults below the college level, counselors, principals, other administrators, supervisors, curriculum specialists, librarians, media specialists, elementary and secondary school students, the parents of elementary and secondary school students, substitute teachers, part-time teachers, teachers who are unemployed or former teachers employed in other capacities who intend to return to teaching, and intern teachers assigned to teach in a school where the teachers are being served by a teacher center assisted under the Teacher Centers Program.

Q. Are there any predetermined criteria regarding the preferred size and scope of a teacher center?

A. No. The law does not make such a determination so the federal office has avoided every pressure to suggest such criteria. It is expected that grant requests will range from $10,000 to over $1,000,000 and that service areas will range from a single school to an entire state. Programs may be proposed to serve a single subject and level of schooling or to serve the full range of personnel and school levels. The deliberate avoidance of specific federal program criteria will not only help ensure that centers serve local needs but will result in a much more varied range of projects than would otherwise occur.

Q. Are school districts not under the jurisdiction of a state (such as Department of Defense schools, dependent schools, and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools) eligible applicants?

A. No. The definition in Section 197.2 of the regulation speaks of "public authority legally constituted within a state." This is interpreted to mean that schools not under the jurisdiction of a state are not considered to be local education agencies under the Teacher Centers Program, and consequently may not apply.

Q. To what extent will the U.S. Commissioner of Education's evaluation criteria be applied to applications for planning grants? How will he instruct reviewers concerning planning applications?

A. Applications for planning grants will be evaluated on criteria (a), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), and (j) of Sec. 197.11 of the Teacher Centers Program regulation. Criteria (b), (c), and (h) apply primarily to applications for operational grants. However, reviewers will be requested to consider the extent to which the planning process described in the application would be likely to result in a program plan which would meet criteria (b), (c), and (h).

Q. Will there be a relationship between the funded teacher centers and other USOE training priorities, for example, education for the handicapped, education of the disadvantaged, career education, consumer education, energy education, metric education, community education?

A. Since the law requires that teacher centers respond to "local" needs, teacher center projects will have complete freedom in the determination of their training and curriculum development programs. They will focus on the needs of the teachers they serve--as perceived by the teachers themselves. However, it is not unlikely that the schools with teacher centers will have needs in the areas given highest priority by USOE.

Q. Will teacher centers give priority to improving instruction in the school and classrooms of the disadvantaged?

A. Although the law does not require such an emphasis, Teacher Center Program projects are required to assess local needs, and it is highly likely that in many cases the special needs of the disadvantaged will be identified and addressed.

Q. Why has USOE not requested funds for Section 533, the Higher Education Personnel Training Program? Does USOE intend to seek for fiscal year 1979 a waiver of the requirement that 10 percent of the appropriation for Section 532 (Teacher Centers) be spent on Section 533?

A. A serious problem is posed by the requirement in Section 531 that at least 10 percent of any appropriation for either of the two programs (Section 532 and Section 533) must be used to fund the other. USOE requested (and was given) a waiver of this requirement when it was believed that Teacher Centers would get only $5 million. There would

not be the same basis for requesting such a waiver if the appropriation is $10.25 million for FY 1979. However, in this case the funds available for Teacher Centers would be reduced to $9.225 million, which would limit the number of additional centers to about 5, an almost meaningless number for a nationwide program.

Q. The Senate conference report which accompanied the FY 1978 appropriation for teacher centers directed that the Teacher Centers Program and the Teacher Corps cooperate to ensure that they do not duplicate services. What steps have been taken to implement that directive?

A. An agreement has been developed between the two programs in which specific areas of concentration (as well as cooperation) have been delineated.

SEA Related

Q. What is the role of the states in this program?

A. It is a most important one. States have the responsibility of reviewing all proposals from within their borders--and will forward to USOE only those proposals that they recommend. They will also provide technical assistance to funded projects in their states and will disseminate information derived from the funded projects.

Q. Is there a formula to guarantee that all regions or states will be represented when grant awards are made?

A. The law does not include any requirement regarding the distribution of funds. Previous experience with discretionary programs of this size indicates that grants will be made in 20-25 states. In the absence of any statutory authority to distribute funds by state or region, it is likely that a significant number of states will not have projects funded within their boundaries.

Q. How many centers will be funded in each state?

A. There is no assurance that at least one application will be approved in each state. All applications transmitted to the Commissioner will compete on equal terms on a nationwide basis for the available funds.

Q. What procedural requirements do the regulations impose for state review of applications?

A. The U.S. Commissioner of Education has no authority to determine how the SEAs' review will be conducted, or to determine who will review the project applications for the SEAs and whether those persons are members of the agencies' own staffs, outsiders, or a combination of these. The Commissioner cannot fund an application unless it has been recommended by the SEA. While it is hoped that the SEAs in reviewing applications will carefully consider the criteria published in Section

197.11, the Commissioner is without authority to prescribe criteria to be used by the SEAs. If SEAs do develop their own criteria for reviewing applications under this program, they are urged to make them public as soon as possible.

Timetable for SEA tasks:

1. Receive applications from applicants by the SEA official closing hour on March 30, 1978

2. Transmit recommended applications to USOE by 4 p.m. on May 1, 1978

3. Reconsider and transmit findings on appealed applications to USOE by 4 p.m. on May 15, 1978.

Q. Since the evaluation criteria do not include consideration of the state education agency's comments in evaluating proposals, why should the SEAs comment in any depth on the proposals they transmit?

A. The comments made by the state education agencies on applications transmitted to the Commissioner will be read by the Commissioner's reviewing panels and will be taken into account insofar as they bear upon the evaluation criteria in Section 197.11.

Q. Who must approve an application before it is submitted for review and evaluation by the SEA?

A. The teacher center policy board is required to approve an application before it is submitted to the SEA. However, an application cannot be submitted for review and evaluation if it has not been signed (and therefore approved) by the proper authority of an eligible applicant. Under the statute, only local education agencies and institutions of higher education are eligible to apply.

Q. How will SEAs be compensated for services rendered under PL 94-482?

A. State education agencies are mandated to:

1. Review and recommend applications
2. Provide technical assistance to funded centers
3. Disseminate information derived from funded centers.

One-tenth of the funds appropriated for the Teacher Centers Program will be used to compensate SEAs for these services. States will be compensated as soon as the amounts due them can be determined. The sums due will be made available before the work of review, technical assistance, and dissemination is undertaken.

Q. Are state education agencies required to submit a plan for technical assistance and dissemination to USOE?

A. The SEA is required to submit, with or in advance of its submission of recommended applications to the Commissioner, the following:

1. A single, general written assurance pertinent to all applications it transmits to the Commissioner, to the effect that the agency:

   a. will provide technical assistance to approved centers within the state, and

   b. will adequately disseminate information derived from those centers; and

2. A single, general statement on how the technical assistance and the dissemination will be performed, together with an estimate of their cost.

Q. When will awards actually be made to successful applicants and their SEAs?

A. SEAs will be compensated for application review immediately after receipt by the U.S. Office of Education of official information as to the number of applications received by the SEA. Compensation for technical assistance and dissemination will be made to a state after all teacher center projects in that state have been funded. It is presently planned that all grant awards will be completed by August 15, 1978.

Q. In what ways does the federal Teacher Centers Program relate to existing state- and federally-funded inservice programs?

A. As long as activities and expenditures comply with the applicable statutes and regulations for each program and are in accordance with the approved application for each program, there is no reason such programs cannot complement each other. The Commissioner recognizes that some states have statewide plans for inservice training of teachers, and that it might be desirable in those cases to integrate the state's teacher centers with those plans. The states already have authority to ensure this integration by means of their role in reviewing and recommending applications. Applicants should be aware of the need to respond to the evaluation criterion which deals with the potential of the teacher center to impact upon and improve the grantee's overall program of inservice training of teachers.

Policy Board

Q. Does the authority given to the policy board by the federal regulation preempt the legal authority of the LEAs and IHEs holding teacher center grants?

A. No. The final legal responsibility for teacher center projects remains with the grantee, which can only be an LEA or IHE. The policy boards are essentially given a "delegation of trust" to develop the kinds of programs that they feel will best help improve instruction within the system. It is essential, not only in applying for the program, but in the operation of a center project, that policy boards and grantee institutions maintain good relations.

Q. Must nonpublic schools be represented on the policy board?

A. If there are nonpublic schools in the area to be served, and they choose to participate in the teacher center, the law requires that they have representation as part of the regular classroom teacher majority of the policy board. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 200d-4) prohibits federal assistance to any school which discriminates on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Therefore, teachers from such a school cannot become members of a teacher center policy board and are not eligible to participate in any of the activities of the teacher center.

Q. How may the teacher members composing the majority of the board be selected?

A. There are several options for doing this, including a "catch-all" option. The common element in all the options is that teachers generally, either directly or through their organizations, must nominate or select the teacher representatives on the policy board.

Q. In the case of a funded teacher center with a given service area from which a properly constituted policy board has been drawn:

1. May the center offer services outside its service area?

2. May the center expand its service area? What conditions must be met?

A. 1. Generally, a teacher center may not offer services, other than dissemination, outside its service area, since the recipients of such services are not represented on the policy board. There may be occasions when a particular program is of such general benefit that participants from outside the service area attend. Such services could only be incidental to the major purposes of the center.

2. A teacher center that wishes to expand its service area can do so only by expanding the representation on its policy board to include proper representation from the additional area. Such expansion, unless projected in the original proposal, can occur only with permission from USOE or as a result of program revisions presented in renewal proposals.

Q. What is to be done if there are many institutions of higher education in the area of service, or if there is none?

A. First of all, the applicant and its teachers must decide how large the teacher center policy board is to be. Then, after determining how many representatives of higher education the board will have (there must be at least one) the applicant will request the IHE or IHEs in the area of service to designate the one or more IHE representatives.

If there is no IHE in the area of service, there may be no legal requirement to include an IHE representative on the board. However,

since this point is not clear, it is probably better to pick one or more IHEs outside the area of service and ask it or them to designate the one or more IHE representatives that the teacher center policy board is to include.

Q. In the case of an intermediate school district which qualifies as an LEA applicant under Section 197.2, and which includes a large number of districts in its service area, must the intermediate district seek representation on the policy board from each school board in its service area, or will it suffice to have school board representation designated solely by the board of the intermediate district itself?

A. It must seek representation from all districts included in the service area in which the teacher center will operate. The policy board must include two or more persons representative of, or designated by, the school board(s) of the local education agency (or agencies) served by the center, but one person may represent more than one school board.

Q. In the case of a funded teacher center with a properly constituted board:

1. How are policy board members replaced?

2. How long may a policy board supervise a project if it is improperly constituted because of the loss of key members?

A. 1. Replacements to policy boards must meet the regulation requirements for the initial formation of the policy board.

2. Since the law and regulation do not address this contingency, it could be dealt with only by the teacher center policy board itself and the grantee.

Other

Q. Do the criteria for evaluating applications also govern evaluation of the operation of funded teacher centers?

A. The criteria for evaluating applications will not govern evaluations of the operation of funded teacher centers. These criteria, however, will be considered by the Commissioner in reviewing applications for continuation which are submitted as the result of an initial planning grant. The continuation of projects operational in the first year is dependent only on satisfactory performance and the availability of federal funds.

Q. May the area to be served by a teacher center be comprised of non-contiguous LEAs?

A. Yes. The definition of the service area of a Teacher Center is the prerogative of the applicant.

Q. What are the procedures and funding potential of applications from a consortium (combination) of LEAs (or LEAs and IHEs)?

A. Applications which involve consortium arrangements will neither have an advantage nor be at a disadvantage in the federal review of applications.

Q. Is there a preferred fiscal agent for consortium grants?

A. No. Each application will be reviewed on its own merits. The regulations do not give a preference in the case of "combination" applications.

Q. May applications include the costs of released time and payment of substitutes to enable regular classroom teachers to participate in the activities of a teacher center?

A. Allowable costs include the payment of released time or substitutes to allow teacher members to participate in activities of the teacher center policy board, and payment for released time or for substitutes necessary to allow teachers to participate in center activities. Applicants should be aware that estimated costs for substitutes or released time must be reasonable in proportion to the rest of their budget.

Appendix C

MUST READING--AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF KEY PUBLICATIONS

The list of publications about teacher centers is growing rapidly, and as the movement increases in size, it will be difficult to keep track of new publications. In the compilation of this bibliography, every effort was made to keep it as brief as possible. Many excellent writings are not included. Interpret this list as "must" reading--material that will be of direct and immediate benefit to you as you plan technical assistance for centers being developed in your state.

Books, Pamphlets, and Speeches

Crum, Mary F., et al. Teacher Centers, March 1977. Bibliographies on Educational Topics No. 6. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1977. ED 134 556. Available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. By far the most comprehensive bibliography on teacher centers, this excellent work by Mary Crum et al. includes 600 entries which have been categorized and cross-referenced according to 42 separate topics. Thirty-three of the publications, for example, have been identified as "State Overviews." The index, which required analysis of every entry, not only leads the reader to materials in specific subject areas, but is in itself a reflection of the anatomy of the teacher center movement and its literature prior to March 1977.

Devaney, Kathleen, Ed. Essays on Teachers' Centers. Available from Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94103. This is a collection of twelve essays about inservice activities that engage teachers' talents and energies while offering intellectual and emotive stimulation and support. Articles are included on development of teacher centers in the United States and England, the role of the in-classroom advisor, teacher design of classroom curriculum, motivations for teachers to invest themselves in further professional growth, evaluation of teacher centers, and the varied learning principles underlying teacher center development and practice.

Edelfelt, Roy A. Teacher Center Legislation and State Departments of Education. Address to Chief State School Officers, November 14, 1977, Kansas City, KS. Available from: Roy A. Edelfelt, Professional Associate, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. In this address, Edelfelt advocated and described prominent teacher roles in three mandated SEA functions (in the federal program) of reviewing proposals, providing technical assistance, and disseminating information. He summarized his concerns with six questions for SEAs:

1. There'll never be enough federal money to fund all the teacher centers needed. State and local money will be needed; how can readiness for such support be fostered?

2. Programs of inservice education other than teacher centers will need to continue. How does one decide the functions and purposes of various kinds of inservice?

3. Almost no state has formal policy to help guide, support, and sustain inservice education. How can statewide policy be developed? Must it be developed independently in 50 states?

4. Federal monies in a variety of programs are available and allocated to inservice education. How are such monies and programs to be related to teacher centers?

5. Inservice education is one of the most direct ways to improve school instructional programs. How does one gather evidence to demonstrate the results of inservice education?

6. Involvement of teachers in decision making, and more directly addressing teacher needs, are demands teacher organizations are making for teacher centered inservice education. What can SEAs do to support these demands?

Pipes, Lana, Ed. Teacher Centers as an Approach to Staff Development in Special Education. Rhode Island Teacher Center Conference Report. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, August 1977. ED 143 619. Available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. Reports on addresses given at a conference to demonstrate how teacher centers and PL 94-142 might complement each other.

Pipes, Lana, Comp. Validated Products from Theory to Practice. Bay Area Learning Center Conference Report. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, May 1977. ED 138 566. Available from ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. This report of a 1977 national conference on the knowledge base for teacher education presents some answers to three basic questions relative to teacher center development: (a) How can centers gain access to previous experiences? (b) How can they validate/adopt/adapt previous experiences? and (c) How can they best develop their own instructional materials/processes where no previous experience exists? The report includes an excellent interview with the chairperson of the Bay Area Learning Center (BALC) Advisory Board on the lessons learned by the BALC in "Starting a Teacher Center."

Schmieder, Allen A., and Sam J. Yarger, Eds. Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1975. ED 098 143. Available from AACTE Order Department, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. This booklet, first published in 1974 and since reprinted, provides a comprehensive overview of the movement at that time. It includes an analysis of the extent and nature of various kinds of centers, a typology, and a discussion of issues and questions.

Yarger, Sam J., and Allen A. Schmieder, Eds. Teacher Centers. Commissioner's Report on the Education Professions 1975-76. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. This collection of articles includes information on the role of the federal government in the development of centers, national overview of inservice education and teacher centers, overview of three USOE-supported teacher centers (two SEA-administered), international perspectives on teacher centers, and the teacher center as an informal workplace. Also included are position papers from the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The most extensive directory of center experience ever published is also included.

Journal Issues and Articles

Educational Leadership, Vol. 33, No. 6; March 1976. Leaders in the teacher center movement write about a number of topics: research on teacher centers, definitional matters, purposes. Also included are case studies of four centers.

Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 25, No. 1; Spring 1974. A thematic section on teacher/teaching centers includes articles on the state of the states, an overview of the movement as of 1974, a teacher's view of teacher centers, and reflections on the future of the movement.

Smith, Emmitt D. "The State of the States in Teacher Centering." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (1): 21-25; Spring 1974. This study analyzes data collected from the offices responsible for teacher education and certification in all 50 states. The article describes briefly most of the state programs and makes six observations on the emerging state role in the teacher center movement:

1. States are beginning to legalize the leadership of the profession in matters dealing with the administration of teacher education and certification, through such groups as the Professional Practices Commissions.

2. States are learning how to synchronize regulatory action and developmental action, which tends to make establishment-oriented change less threatening; yet the establishment is still able to undergird progress when it happens through regular formalization procedures.

3. States are beginning to fund local innovative efforts--to use state funding for developmental purposes.

4. States are beginning to utilize the "lighthouse" concept in development--that is, establish pilots for study.

5. States are beginning to tear down the wall between preservice and inservice teacher education and to treat them as a continuum.

6. States are beginning to consider movements such as CBTE/PBTE and teacher centering as elements in a well-designed process for systemic educational improvement rather than ends in themselves.

Periodicals

Advisory and Learning Exchange. The Advisory and Learning Exchange, 1101 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 (bi-monthly)

British Journal of In-Service Education. London, UK, Schools Council (3 times annually)

CPDP. Newsletter of the Continuous Professional Development Program, School of Education, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36830 (3 editions annually)

In Touch. University of Massachusetts, School of Education, Amherst, MA 01002 (4 times annually)

Notes from Workshop Center for Open Education. City College School of Education, Workshop Center for Open Education, New York, NY 10010 (4 times yearly)

Outlook. University of Colorado, Mountain View Center for Environmental Education, Boulder, CO 80302 (quarterly)

Staff Development Newsletter. A Forum for the Development of Human Resources. Professional Development Associates, P.O. Box 4303, Austin, TX 78765 (10 annually)

Teacher Inservice: Step Ahead. Washington County Intermediate Education District, Hillsboro, OR 97123

Teacher Training. Newsletter of USOE Task Force '72 Teacher Center Network, Washington, D.C. (Discontinued, but copies of all editions available for study in USOE Teacher Center Reference File)

Teachers' Center Exchange. Far West Laboratory, San Francisco, CA 94103 (irregular)

The Teachers' Center. The Teachers' Center, Visalia, CA 93277 (monthly)

Update: Teacher Centers. Syracuse-East Genesee Teacher Center, 1117 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, NY 13210 (irregular)

Appendix D

NATIONAL TEACHER CENTERS PROGRAM:
STATE COORDINATORS

AL Dr. William C. Berryman
Director, Division of
Instruction
State Department of Education
501 Dexter Avenue
Montgomery, AL 36130
205/832-3400

AK Marilou Madden
Director, Division of
Educational Program Support
Department of Education
Pouch F--State Office Building
Juneau, AK 99811
907/465-2830

AZ Thomas R. Reno
Associate Superintendent
Arizona Department of Education
1535 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602/271-4361

AR Austin Z. Hanner
Coordinator of Teacher
Education Certification
Department of Education
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/371-1474

CA William E. Webster
Coordinator
Department of Education
State Education Building
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/322-5588

CO Arvin C. Blome
Executive Assistant
Federal Relations
Colorado Department of Education
State Office Building
201 E. Colfax
Denver, CO 80203
303/892-2212

CT Roberta Howells
Consultant for Physical Education
Connecticut State Department of
Education
Hartford, CT 06115
203/566-3873

DE Ervin C. Marsh
State Director of Certification
and Personnel
Department of Instruction
Dover, DE 19901
302/678-4601

DC Joan Brown
Special Assistant for
Competency-Based Curriculum
Office of the Superintendent
415 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202/722-4222

FL James Parris
Associate for Teacher Education
State of Florida
Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304
904/488-0642

GA Robert Christian
Consultant, Teacher Education
Georgia State Department of
Education
302 State Office Building
Atlanta, GA 30334
404/656-2431

HI Mipsugi Nakashima
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, HI 96804
808/548-6583

ID Miles D. Williams
Idaho State Department of Education
Lem B. Jordon Building
Boise, ID 83720
208/384-3475

IL Arnette Rauschel
Education Consultant
Illinois Office of Education
Teacher Centers, Program
Planning and Development
100 North First
Springfield, IL 62777
217/782-0359

IN Ronald A. Boyd
Associate Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317/633-4762

IA Donald Cox
Associate Superintendent--
Instruction and Professional
Education
State of Iowa, Department of
Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
515/281-5609

KS Mary Martin
Program Specialist
Kansas State Department of
Education
Kansas State Education Building
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612
913/296-3047

KY Taylor Hollin
Assistant Bureau Head
Bureau of Instruction
Department of Education
Frankfort, KY 40601
502/564-3010

LA Pamela Cox
Coordinator, State of Louisiana
Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
504/389-2471

ME Daryl Hahn
State Department of Educational
and Cultural Services
Augusta, ME 94333
207/289-2321

MD Richard McKay
Assistant State Superintendent
Office of Developmental Projects
Maryland State Department
of Education
P.O. Box 8717, BWI Airport
Baltimore, MD 21240
301/796-8300, x320

MA James Case
Director, Bureau of Certification
Department of Education
31 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116

MI Carol Lewis
Director, Office of Professional
Development
Michigan State Department
of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
517/373-3608

MN Patricia J. Goralski
Specialist, Division of
Special Services
Department of Education
610 Capitol Square Boulevard
550 Cedar Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55101
612/296-1220

MS Bob McCord
Assistant State Superintendent
of Education
Mississippi State Department
of Education
Jackson, MS 39205
601/354-7011

MO Richard King
Staff Coordinator of
Curriculum Services
Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education
Jefferson City, MO 65101
314/751-2625

MT John Voorhis
Manager, Teacher Education
and Certification
Office of Public Instruction
Helena, MT 59601
406/449-3150

NB Sharon K. Meyer
Consultant, School Management
Services
Nebraska Department of Education
Box 94987
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, NB 68509
402/471-2295

NV Edward H. Howard
Assistant Director
Educational Accountability
Nevada Department of Education
Carson City, NV 89501
702/885-5700, x245

NH George Lewis
Consultant, Commissioner's
Office
State Department of Education
410 State House Annex
Concord, NH 03301
603/271-3144

NJ Maryann C. Peifly
Assistant Deputy Commissioner
State of New Jersey
Department of Education
225 West State Street
P.O. Box 2019
Trenton, NJ 08625
609/292-4452

NM Jim Pierce
Department of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505/827-2282

NY Vincent Gazzetta
Director, Division of Teacher
Education and Certification
New York State Department of
Education
99 Washington Avenue, Room 1941
Albany, NY 12234
518/474-5844

NC Earle Harper
Division of Staff Development
Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC 27611
919/733-3813

ND Lowell Jensen
Deputy State Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction
Bismarck, ND 58505
701/224-2262

OH William Phillips
Ohio Department of Education
Division of Educational Redesign
and Renewal
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215
614/466-2979

OK Stan Cobb
Administrator, Teacher Education
Section
Oklahoma State Department
of Education
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405/521-3607

OR Ray Talbert
Specialist, Grants Management
Oregon Department of Education
942 Lancaster Drive, N.E.
Salem, OR 97310
503/378-8004

PA Randall S. Bauer
Regional In-Service Coordinator
Office of In-Service Education
Pennsylvania Department of
Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, PA 17126
717/783-1830

PR Iris Vazquez de Brunet
Assistant Secretary for
Planning and Development
Department of Education
Hato Rey, PR 00919
809/765-3493

RI Edward L. Dambruch
Rhode Island Department of
Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, RI 02908
401/277-2675

SC Albert H. H. Dorsey
Supervisor of Teacher Education
Office of Teacher Education and
Certification
Columbia, SC 29201
803/758-3291

SD James O. Hansen
Assistant Superintendent of
Instructional Services
Division of Elementary and
Secondary Education
Department of Education
New State Office Building
Pierre SD 57501
605/ 24-3315

TN Joe Minor
Chief of Curriculum Services Section
Division of Instructional Services
Tennessee Department of Education
112 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 37219
615/741-2265

TX James Kidd
Texas Education Agency
Division of Teacher Education
201 East 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-3271

UT LaMar Allred
Coordinator, In-Service Staff
Development
Utah State Board of Education
250 East Fifth South Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801/533-5431

VT Henry S. Bissex
Assistant Director
Teacher and Continuing Education
Department of Education
Montpelier, VT 95602
802/828-3131

VA Everette B. Howerton, Jr.
Assistant Superintendent
Administrative Field Services
Department of Education
P.O. Box 60
Richmond, VA 23216
804/786-2612

WA Lillian Cady
Director, Professional Education
and Certification
Washington State Department
of Education
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, WA 98504
206/753-1031

WI Robert Skeway
Supervisor, In-Service Staff
Development
Bureau of Teacher Education
and Certification
Wisconsin Department of Education
126 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53702
608/266-3803

WY Robert G. Schrader
Superintendent of Public
Instruction
State Department of Education
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307/777-7673

Joe Oakey
Department of Education
Pago Pago, Tutila
American Samoa 96799
633-5673

Appendix E

OTHER MAJOR RESOURCE CENTERS

Teacher Center Staff

Allen Schmieder
Saundra Freeman
Patricia Allen
Charles Lovett
Reginald Pearman

Teacher Centers Program
BOAE/DESD--Room 5652
ROB #3, 7th and D Sts., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202/245-2235

Other OE Resources

Drew Lebby
Consultant, Division of
Educational Replication
ROB #3, 7th & D Sts., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202/245-9582

Jasper Harvey
Director of Educational
Personnel Development Branch
Bureau of Education for
the Handicapped
400 6th Street, S.W., Room 4805
Washington, D.C. 20202
202/245-9886

Bob Ardike
Special Assistant to
the Director
Teacher Corps Program
Donohue Building, Room 1700
400 6th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202/245/0035

Lucia Olmstead
Education Program Specialist
Teacher Corps Program
Donohue Building, Room 1700
400 6th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202/245-8223

Grace Watson
Education Program Specialist
Career Education Program
ROB #3, Room 3108-A
7th and D Sts., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202/245-2549

Education Division Resources

Gary Sykes
NIE Associate
Group on School Capacity for
Problem Solving
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208
202/254-6090

Virginia Koehler
Chief, Teaching Division
Basic Skills Group
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W., Rm. 815
Washington, D.C. 20208
202/254-5407

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

Karl Massanari, Director
Hop Davies, Associate Director
Lana Pipes, Editor

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Rm. 616
Washington, D.C. 20036 202/293-7280

Related Projects

Patricia Weiler
Teacher Center Project Director
American Federation of Teachers
11 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/797-4463

Roy Edelfelt
Teacher Center Project Director
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/833-4117

Sam Yarger
National Teacher Center
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13210
315/423-3026

Teachers' Center Exchange

Kathleen Devaney
Lorraine Keeney
William Hering

Teachers' Center Exchange
Far West Laboratory
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
415/565-3097